A U M

True words always seem paradoxical, but no other form of teaching can take its place.
—LAO-TSE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLII December, 1953 No. 2

GATHERING MOMENTUM

NOT just students of Theosophy, but all the world is looking for some kind of break in the gloom of these dark days. There is a general sense that something will have to "give," somewhere—that, surely, the peoples of this enlightened age will somehow find a way to make the recent past seem like no more than an evil dream.

This mood has doubtless been a recurring one, ever since the beginning of *Kali Yuga,* and if it now seems more intense—more of a "last-ditch" feeling than similar moods known to the memory of the present generation—this may be explained by our position on the curve of the hundred-year cycle, which is a point traveling inward toward the hours of crisis and precipitation of the last quarter of the century.

Meanwhile, we may recall the longings for the rebirth of a Golden Age which have found voice in almost every epoch of history. In India, there has been the dream of another great incarnation of Vishnu—the Kalki Avatar—who is to make all things new. The Buddhists acquainted with the doctrine of cycles believe that Buddha and his Arhats will some day return to make, not just all Asia, perhaps, but the entire world mild. The Kabalistic Jews have not forgotten their teaching of the coming of the Messiah, and the past thousand years reveal several instances of wonderful figures who have moved among this melancholy and persecuted people, lightening their burdens with wise counsels. In the modern East, Gandhi was able to revive a sense of the spiritual capacities of human beings, and we may think that while he worked in India, his lesson was intended for a wider population.

The pessimists, however, especially in recent years, usually seem to have the last word. Victor Hugo, dreaming of universal peace, hoped, and even dramatically predicted, that some sort of millennium of peace would dawn in the twentieth century. So far, performance has fallen far short of his anticipation. Such dreams, however, continue, even when by no means as articulate as the hope of the French poet. And if the dreams do not come true, it will not be because of a failure in reading the future in terms of its possibilities, but because of an inability to realize what basic changes in human attitude are essential for bringing them about.

Since the collective scene is far too complex for analysis by any but those with the purview of the authors of *The Secret Doctrine,* we may, perhaps, be content with considering the processes by which individual human dreams of high achievement may be turned into reality. The first necessity, perhaps, is in acquiring a nobler idea of the self. It is characteristic of human nature to suffer polarization first toward too mean an estimate of one's abilities, then in the direction of conceit and too generous an assumption of merit. Nor is there any solution found in a fair balance of self-appraisal. For when a man looks to define his own "status," he is bound to neglect the work which goes on throughout the universe, regardless of status or degree. The Self is without status. It is the common element in all beings, the reality which does not fall with the low, nor ascend to the heights with the highly placed. It is simply there—everywhere.

We never have real occasion to berate ourselves, nor to congratulate ourselves. There is no strength in either, but only delusion. Arjuna was depressed because he saw himself in isolation, an unhappy prince, caught upon a battlefield from which there was no escape save in attacking those he held dear and in respect. A movement of his awareness of self from the stature of the prince to the timeless vision of Krishna dissolved the mood of depression. Arjuna exchanged his personal idea of self for—not just a "larger" view, but—a view which was without limit or definition. Thus he was able to return to the work of the prince without the sadness which haunted that time, place, and circumstances. *He* was no longer caught in the net of enclosing dilemmas; the presence of Krishna in him made him free. It was a little thing, perhaps: he did not move a muscle, turned neither to right nor to left; yet he traversed the infinite within a moment of self-realization.

What Arjuna gained was the confidence that he was equal to anything which might come to pass. It is reliance on the Law, it is resignation, it is renunciation of the fruits of action, and it is wisdom in action. It is all these things, since it grows from quiet acceptance of the two eternal aspects of thinking beings—responsibilities and powers.

What Arjuna lost, in that moment, was fear. He lost the fear that he might not gain heights of spiritual perception; the fear that, by neglecting the precepts of tradition, he would lose caste among his countrymen. To reach this state is a kind of crossing of the Rubicon of human evolution, a passage through the moment of choice between the lunar and the solar lines of identity. How difficult it seems to be to find this motionless center of life! On first studying the self, says William Q. Judge, it is like looking into the fingers of a glove—a dark and apparently unrewarding mystery. Lao-tse lamented the inconclusive effect of what he had to teach. "Alas," he exclaimed, "the barrenness of the age has not reached its limit." "Other men are full of light; I alone seem to be in darkness." Yet the Sage carried the jewel of wisdom in his bosom. He revered the *Tao.*

There is the yearning which must never cease, and the wearing away of that which cloys the yearning and hides its true quality. The yearning is not a special virtue which is added to a man by fortunate decision, but is an expression of egoity on this plane—a wholly natural energy of the heart. Like the light of mind, its flow may be diverted into personal channels, where it experiences partial satieties and bitter disillusionments, until, finally, it learns to recognize its own fulfillment in the love of man for man.

It is love that brings the ultimate release from the sense of inadequacy. The love which exists between human beings is really an appreciation of the undetermined and undeterminable freedom which they find in each other. Self-consciousness brings us very close to the fabric of the Self in all, and love is the intuitive sense of being blessed in an association of consciousness. In the eyes of others we somehow "see" the unfathomable depths of a timeless existence in both directions of duration, and from the perception of this order of life within the time-bound and struggling ordeal of the present, we obtain a peace which reconciles the finite with the infinite.

A brave man, a heroic man, always stands with endless hierarchies of life behind him, even when he seems to stand entirely alone. The

secret of the ages is that any man can always take this position. He needs no one at his shoulder, no one to whisper in his ear, yet because he has no need, all nature is his ally.

So with the cycle which lies ahead. Somehow, for the dream of the Golden Age to come true, there must be born the courage and confidence which arise from the deeper self in human beings. The words men use to speak of these things will not matter very much, nor the particular paths by which they come to self-recognition. It is a question of the maturing of the age, the ripening of a harvest of human evolution. The yearning continues, and who knows how close to gossamer-thin are worn the masks of self-deception, which hide the visage of a brother in our fellow man.

THE HIDING OF ONESELF

We are all responsible to all for all. So soon as men understand that, the Kingdom of Heaven will be for them not a dream, but a living reality. This dream, as you call it, will come to pass without doubt; it will come, but not now, for every process has its law. It's a spiritual, psychological process. To transform the world, to recreate it afresh, men must turn into another path psychologically. Until you have become really, in actual fact, a brother to every one, brotherhood will not come to pass. No sort of scientific teaching, no kind of common interest, will ever teach men to share property and privileges with equal consideration for all. You ask when it will come to pass; it will come to pass, but first we have to go through the period of isolation.

Why, the isolation that prevails everywhere, above all in our age—it has not fully developed, it has not reached its limit yet. All mankind in our age have split up into units, they all keep apart, each in his own groove; each one holds aloof, hides himself and hides what he has, from the rest. We must keep the banner flying. Sometimes even if he has to do it alone, and his conduct seems to be crazy, a man must set an example, and so draw men's souls out of their solitude, and spur them to some act of brotherly love, that the great idea may not die.

—FYODOR DOSTOYEVSKY

THE MEANING OF A PLEDGE

IT has been thought advisable that members of a certain Occult Lodge of the T.S. should have the meaning of the Pledge they are about to take laid before them as plainly as possible. At any rate, that those who have previously signed the Pledge shall lay before those who are about to do so all that they understand this Pledge to mean and what its signature involves.

The Pledge runs as follows:

1. I pledge myself to endeavour to make Theosophy a living factor in my life.
2. I pledge myself to support, before the world, the Theosophical movement, its leaders and its members.
3. I pledge myself never to listen without protest to any evil thing spoken of a Brother Theosophist and to abstain from condemning others.
4. I pledge myself to maintain a constant struggle against my lower nature, and to be charitable to the weaknesses of others.
5. I pledge myself to do all in my power, by study or otherwise, to fit myself to help and teach others.
6. I pledge myself to give what support I can to the movement in time, money, and work.

"So Help Me My Higher Self."

It is at once plain that this is not a general Pledge like that which is taken so lightly by members of the Theosophical Society; but that it is a specific undertaking to do and to endeavour to do certain things. Also that it is given under an invocation:—

"So help me my Higher Self."

The term "Higher Self" has recently come into considerable use—at any rate so far as the Theosophical Society is concerned. To those who have studied the meaning of the words it is at once evident that to "take an oath" in the ordinary fashion of Christians is much less serious than a Pledge in presence of the "Higher Self."

The "Higher Self," moreover, is not a sort of sublimated essence of any one man; a sort of spiritualised "personality." *It* is universal

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1888, and reprinted in THEOSOPHY for November, 1914.

and secondless and in such a sense the term "*my* Higher Self" seems misplaced. But every man, however dimly, is a manifestation of the Higher Self, and it is by the connection of the Jiva, the Monad, with the secondless "Higher Self" that it is possible to use the term. What then does the invocation mean?

The man who takes this Pledge in the right spirit calls upon It, and calls every help and blessing from It to his assistance. By an intense desire to be under Its protection he (though It *per se* is latent and passive) places himself under the protection of the active and beneficent powers that are the direct rays of the Absolute Higher Secondless Self.

But if a man takes this Pledge and betrays his Higher Self, he risks every evil and *brings it upon himself.* Thus then, he who remains true to the Pledge has nothing to fear; but he who has no confidence in himself to keep the Pledge when taken, had better leave it and, much more, leave Occultism alone.

Breaking this Pledge cannot, then, involve penalty on the "Higher Self," but it can affect the individual man. The "Higher Self" is immortal, but the Monad exists as a separate individual only during the Manvantaras, and around it various personalities are formed. This incarnates at every new birth, and not only can be, but is, punished if such a Pledge is broken. Once that it has progressed far enough to recognise the glorious light of the Higher Self and desire to live in it, the breaking of the Pledge tends towards a condition which would preclude the possibility of that light not only benefiting the Monad, but even reaching it.

Thus all men are in the presence of two forces in nature. One of them active and beneficent, whose aid and assistance is directly invoked by the Pledge; the other active, but maleficent, which is represented by beings who have a distinct interest in preventing the operation of the Pledge, and in hindering the work of the Theosophical Society. We see this more clearly when we know that we Pledge ourselves *to be* active, and not merely to endeavour to be.

Further, there are powers on the earth and in the flesh, as well as in the astral light, who desire to prevent and hinder the Pledge from taking effect. Some of these act consciously in this manner, and others because they are driven to such conscious action, but without any knowledge of the reason or force which drives them thereto.

We are to endeavour to "make Theosophy a living factor in our lives." Before we can *endeavour* to do this, much less *do* it effectually, we must first understand what Theosophy is, and actually define to ourselves what we individually mean by Theosophy. Now it is exactly this definition, its want, and our ignorance generally which hitherto has prevented us from carrying out this endeavour. Nothing need here be said of the Theosophical Society and the benefit which would come to it by even a small section of its members actually making Theosophy *the* living factor in their lives. Very few do so, and it is only too true that a member of the Theosophical Society is not necessarily a Theosophist. But those who take this Pledge are not content to remain nominally members of the Society, but aspire to be Theosophists indeed. And therefore it is so necessary that all should learn what a Theosophist is, and what any man must do to make Theosophy a *living* factor in his life.

As a negative definition nothing could be better than the definition in *Lucifer* No. 3:

"He who does not practise altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defence as he would undertake his own—is no Theosophist."

But this definition also contains the positive side. It is not sufficient merely to abstain from doing that which is condemned in this definition. The negative side alone is useless to those who take this Pledge —and not merely useless, for it involves practically the breaking of the Pledge. The Pledge demands not only that the man who takes it shall abstain from evil doing but, more, that he shall *positively* work altruistically and defend any innocent person as he would himself.

Many men may be so colourless as not to offend against the negative clauses of the Pledge and definition; but few are they who are sufficiently positive in their own character as not only not to offend against these clauses but also work in the opposite direction. For the greatest importance does not consist in "I will not" but in the "I will do." Thus some strength is needed for impersonality. This impersonality is of two kinds, negative and positive. For the negative, strength

is needed to fight against the forces of heredity and education, and prevent obedience to the instincts and acquired habits of this and other incarnations. But greater strength is needed to cross the zero-point and create new instincts and habits in the midst of conditions of life and habits of thought which are violently opposed to the new creation. And it would seem that strength is required so that it would be possible to conquer the tendencies of a devil and grow up into divinity. And if we regard the Pledge generally it would seem to be an admirable instrument, in view of the above quoted definition, for finding out and assailing everybody on their weak points. As men and women the Pledge compels us to refrain from acting and thinking in our daily life as our education has hitherto compelled us to do. If we do not so refrain, we do not make Theosophy a living factor in our lives. And more, while we are engaged in this difficult task, the positive side appears and we are told that we have to do other things as difficult—otherwise we are not Theosophists.

The second clause of the Pledge will prove a stumbling block to many lukewarm members of the Theosophical Society. Many may be in complete accord with the objects of the Theosophical Society, so far as they understand them, but also be in complete disagreement with the leaders of the Society and their method of work. Not only may they disagree but also be in either open or concealed hostility to those leaders and many of the members. It is of no use to disguise from ourselves the fact that this has been the case, and unfortunately may be so again. We work for "Universal Brotherhood" and we are at enmity with our immediate neighbours. This then we pledge ourselves to put a stop to, and to excise the tendency from our natures. Thus Clause 2 has a special reference to certain persons arising out of the general circumstances.

The question naturally arises: "Of what use is a Theosophical Society with such aims, when it is composed of such diverse elements?" And again: "Has the Society any coherence and purpose which shall make *it* a living power in the society by which it is surrounded?" For an analogy exists; and the Society is an individual among societies, just as men and women are individuals. And it may here be emphatically stated that the power and force of any given body is not the total force of its component units, but that the body has an individual force and power of its own apart from them. One has but to turn to the

chemistry of "alloys" to see that this is true. If then we regard the Society, it does not seem that any of its strength is due to the united purpose and action of its individual members. But it has a great purpose, and to this a certain number of devoted individuals have sacrificed all that lay in their power. Among these the founders and present leaders of the Society are notable examples. The result is that the Society continues to exist exoterically. But the continued existence of the Society is not due to these few individual efforts alone but to the underlying influence of those under whose direction the Society was founded by its present leaders, and to the fostering care of those Masters in Wisdom, after it was founded.

Clause 3 opens out to many, as the Society is at present constituted, a good deal of casuistical reasoning. It has been said, and it would seem truly said, that it is perfectly open to those who are true Theosophists to condemn an act but not the actor. But this will be found to be a distinction which is very subtle and difficult to make in life. "Light on the Path," too, warns the aspirant against self-righteousness of a like character, "for the soiled garment you shrink from touching may have been yours yesterday, may be yours tomorrow." Thus those who take this Pledge are about to meet a very subtle difficulty (for in life the act and the actor are indissolubly connected), unless they have attained the power of observing and reading on a plane which is at present beyond the reach of the majority of mankind. However, even if this power is beyond reach at present, it is at all events right for those who aspire to be Theosophists to try. We can at least put a bridle on our physical lips and endeavour to do so on our mind, and thus abstain from "condemning others." For the silent condemnation of the mind would seem more "vicious" than physical speech, for, at any rate in the "judge," it is a form of moral cowardice. And herein lies the casuistry. For apart from the definition in *Lucifer,* No. 3, it has been open to those who take the Pledge to consider that their human brothers are not "Brother Theosophists," and therefore that it is legal to judge and condemn. Thus if it could be clearly proven that any man or woman has erred against the said definition it might be possible to receive absolution from the pledge "never to listen without protest to any evil thing spoken" of them. But the definition stops this with its "whether a brother Theosophist or not," and agrees with the legal maxim which is so seldom acted upon—always to consider

a man innocent until proved guilty. Suspicion is a dangerous guest to harbour, and we are finally brought back to the fact that it is best to "judge not that ye be not judged."

Clauses 4 and 5 are the completion of resolutions which go straight to the centre of all that militates against Theosophy and against its forming a living factor in men's lives. In this sense Clause 6 is a completion also. But the power to help and teach others can only be found in the united spirit of life, which is a spirit of absolute equality and in the sense that to the Theosophist every man is a teacher.

Clause 6 is a ratification of all that has gone before, but places it in more definite terms.

Thus then before this Pledge is taken it is necessary for all who aspire to take it to carefully ascertain, before pledging themselves to work and activity for Theosophy, what Theosophy really is. Is Theosophy identical with the practice of the Theosophical Society? If it is not, ought it to be? Shall I endeavour to make it so? In pledging myself to work for it, am I in the near or distant future, in this or in some succeeding incarnation, looking for a reward? It would seem that one of the first requisites is to endeavour to "Know Thyself."

Such a Pledge must not be taken lightly nor in a spirit of mere emotionalism. It has to be taken with a stern resolution to ever and ever more fully carry out its requirements, even at all costs to the man who takes it. It is taken at the risk of the man who takes it in a thoughtless spirit without examining what it really means and without the intention of making its fulfillment the supreme object of his life.

It is necessary "to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the truths which exist in Theosophy and then perhaps there may dawn upon the world the day when all men shall be as brothers, and Universal Brotherhood shall be a reality and the guide of all existence.

ONE WHO IS PLEDGED

WORD PUZZLES

THERE seems no end to the exploration of words whose essential original meanings have been corrupted through usage—and particularly by authoritarianism of one sort or another. Words tend towards rigidity, it seems, and become excuses for coercion, whenever a culture disbelieves in the progressive evolution of the human soul and that such evolution can be furthered only by "self-induced and self-devised efforts." When rules and restrictions replace the counsels of individual conscience, the vision of the soul is lost.

According to its original meaning, the word *arbitration* contains a wealth of theosophical significance. For an *arbiter* was not at first considered to be one who pronounced final judgment. He was, instead, "the one who goes out to see what he can do" in effecting a better adjustment and understanding between disputants. He sought the "adjustment" of human affairs; he was an educator rather than judge —the only valid theosophical approach, for, as H. P. Blavatsky once wrote in the *Theosophist,* "even the Mahatmas are the servants, not the arbiters, of Karma."

In all present instances wherein something called a "Board of Arbitration" forces a decision upon participants, the prerogatives of Karma have been usurped and the original meaning of *arbiter* corrupted. *Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* reveals that the whole point of distinguishing between arbitration procedure and judicial procedure is that "arbitration is entirely voluntary and a submission to arbitration is revocable by either party." Thus, a desire to substitute arbitration for an enforceable judgment is an attempt to preserve inviolate the conscience of the individual. The aim is primarily to seek further enlightenment on a dispute through exchange of opinions. One who proposes or accepts an offer of arbitration need not thereby agree, then, even to abide by the decision of the majority of an arbitration board. His agreement obliges him only to take part in discussion, and to listen to what others have to say. Finally, then, arbitration is ideally designed to be an educative process in which the parties concerned do *not* seek an enforceable "ruling."

The values of the arbitration-process seem theosophically obvious, if arbitration be recognized as an alternative to the physical or psycho-

logical violence potential in most disputes. Fair arbitration also tends to depersonalize grievances by extending the psychological situation to include the arbiter or arbitrators. Further, the first condition of arbitration requires that disputed matters be brought up openly in the presence of the disputing parties, thus leaving less excuse for behind-the-back spreading of grievances to other un-involved persons. The most important benefits of arbitration are clearly derived from whatever new perspectives may be developed by participants during deliberation.

In a further attempt to analyze "arbitration," we may consider the process in terms of three phases or stages. Though these three stages are often loosely combined and confused, it seems profitable to separate the three for purposes of discussion, just as one must *undertake* them separately in arbitration procedure. Three stages of the arbitration process may be set down as follows:

1. Establishment of facts—mutual admission of central, salient facts.

2. Deliberation concerning the facts established. (This part of the process should rightly include deliberation in respect to attitudes held by disputants, after recognition that no "fact" of itself *a priori* justifies an attitude. During this stage no decision need be reached, for what is sought is a *clarification of issues,* and a clarification of the nature of the relationships involved. The tools used in this phase of deliberation are reason and logic. A decision can be reached at this stage only by *mutual assent,* but since this is the most desirable end to be sought, concentration upon this phase would seem to be of the greatest psychological and philosophical importance.)

3. Decision, or the final or technically definitive phase of arbitration, according to most modern usage. Decision involves assessing moral responsibility or liability. Our Western culture, it seems, seldom fits anyone well for this part of an arbiter's role. Court decisions, for instance, are at best *approximations* of solutions of difficulties. The Guru, the spiritual and moral teacher of ancient tradition, is a better example of one having the "right" to assign moral responsibility in the case of a pupil, but this right was given by the pupil himself upon his request to become a pupil, and rested upon the belief on the part of the disciple that the Sage knew phases of the disciple's nature better than the disciple himself. Save in the case of such a unique relationship, it seems necessary to recognize that all final decisions of importance must be reached by the disputants themselves.

Special attention naturally focusses on the deliberative phase, as in the case of arbitration courts dealing with domestic relations. Here an advisory board strives to illuminate the minds and attitudes of the participants, rather than to gain a quick "decision." Interestingly enough, it is also possible for a party or parties to assist in philosophical deliberation without a minute study of specific facts and alleged facts, since many of these "facts" involve past situations so emotionally charged as to prejudice objective thinking on the part of the disputants. What is needed is a search for the reasons precluding disputants from viewing the same "facts" in the same light. This part of the arbitration process may be called "counselling"; counselling is an essential part of the total arbitration process whenever both disputants are present.

Whenever *arbitration* is designed to result in an enforceable decision, even today, it is interesting to note, special statutes of law have to be enacted, it being recognized that such a process is a special case or partial derivative of arbitration in its original meaning. Thus we see a transition stage between the first meaning of *arbitration*—meaning the opposite of *arbitrary*—and the common acceptation of the latter word. For to be "arbitrary" is to be authoritarian, to compel acceptance of a decision made. "Arbitrary" itself originally meant something "determinable by decision of a judge or tribunal rather than defined by statute or discretion," thus leaving room for recognition of the fact that every dispute is a special case and need not have predetermined penalties for a "loser." The second meaning of arbitrary—derived again from distortion of the original meaning by prevalent belief in the moral validity of coercion—suggests that an arbitrary decision is one which may be "arrived at by caprice." By this time the usage of arbitrary has come full circle, just as occurs when a body calling itself a "Board of Arbitration" is provided with statutes making its decisions enforceable. "Authoritarian" means the "advocacy of the principle of obedience to authority as opposed to any individual liberty," and is the direct antithesis of the principles of arbitration.

When it is remarked by theosophical students in the promulgation of theosophical principles that man is the "arbiter of his own destiny," this implies that he and he alone can adjust the intricacies of his own karma. In other words, the stress is not upon "judgment," *even of oneself,* but upon a constructive working with the potentialities of

growth hidden behind confusion and conflict of purposes. The result of pure arbitration is never anything more definitive than a *promise* (from compromise), a declaration of intent to abide by an agreement for *arbitration.* But the "compromise," if it offend a basic principle in the mind of one of the disputants, is not binding.

It is difficult to imagine what a different psychological world this would be if *arbitration,* in the sense discussed here, were to replace enforceable judicial rulings, but it is quite apparent that the change, to whatever degree effected, would be for the betterment of man. The *arbiter,* and also those who invite his services, is one who "goes to seek" an improvement of situation. This suggests an outgoing of human sympathy and understanding, and an outgoing of mind in the hope of discovering alternatives not yet perceived. On the other hand, one who seeks redress in a court of law, or who endeavors to make "arbitration" enforceable, and failure to abide by the terms of arbitration punishable, are *retracting* their minds from the prospect of voluntary "compromise." So it is, again, that we find legal procedure faithfully reflecting the failings of human relationships which, all too often, involve the manipulation of a coercive agency.

Arbitration discussion undertaken in the hope of clarifying issues between disputants could be of great theosophic value, we may repeat, but never if a "Board of Arbitration" is given power to compel acceptance of decisions reached. Nor, in the last analysis, is a "decision" even necessary in order to fulfill the chief value inherent in arbitration procedure. One submitting to arbitration simply "puts himself to the *risk* of being lessened," by having his views subjected to the scrutiny of others. His "risk" is only that, in order to promote or retain good will, he may *desire* to revise opinions formerly inflexible.

Obviously, no one is well qualified for participation in arbitration unless he conducts his ordinary affairs in a conciliatory spirit, and especially unless he is free of tendencies to make categorical, inflexible judgments. Those who need the benefits of arbitration the most are thus, unfortunately, the least likely to seek it in a manner capable of bringing about beneficial results. The man who wishes to obtain "judgment," whether by judicial means or by enforceable arbitrary provisions, is an impatient man, and the worthy arbitrator must be a man of infinite patience. The desire for a rapid solution to a dispute is, in the last analysis, a lack of trust in the power of reason.

Anyone can institute the most beneficial aspects of arbitration proceedings in his relationships with his acquaintances. The highest manifestation of the "judicial" quality is impartial thinking and speaking—a habit which can serve as a good preventative against the arising of disputes in the first place. The man who grasps the essential original meaning of the term arbitration, incidentally, is one who seldom needs a formal grouping of acquaintances to help him discover educative means for resolving disputes or differences of opinion. If the primary aim is educative, if two disputants care less about winning the "award" of an arbiter's approval than they care about learning the most that may be learned in the process of discussion, graciousness prevails and mutual understanding becomes possible.

The Higher Inconclusiveness

Man must accept the responsibility for himself and the fact that only by using his own powers can he give meaning to his life. But meaning does not imply certainty; indeed, the quest for certainty blocks the search for meaning. Uncertainty is the very condition to impel man to unfold his powers.

The disharmony of man's existence generates needs which far transcend those of his animal origin. These needs result in an imperative drive to restore a unity and equilibrium between himself and the rest of nature. He makes the attempt to restore this unity and equilibrium in the first place in thought, by constructing an all-inclusive mental picture of the world, which serves as a frame of reference from which he can derive an answer to the question of where he stands and what he ought to do. But such thought-systems are not sufficient. If man were only a disembodied intellect his aim would be achieved by a comprehensive thought-system. But since he is an entity endowed with a body as well as a mind he has to react to the dichotomy of his existence not only in thinking but also in the process of living, in his feelings and actions. He has to strive for the experience of unity and oneness in all spheres of his being in order to find a new equilibrium.

—Erich Fromm

SOURCE OF PANTHEISM

"The Third Race became the Vahan of the Lords of Wisdom. It created 'Sons of Will and Yoga'; by Kriyasakti it created them, the Holy Fathers, ancestors of the Arhats."

THE Secret Doctrine teaches *history,* and it says that the "Watchers" or the "Architects" furnished the many and various races with *divine* kings and teachers. It is the latter who taught humanity their arts and sciences. It is they who laid the first foundation-stone of those ancient civilizations that puzzle so sorely our modern generation of students and scholars. They taught to the just-created men the arts and sciences, which have been cultivated and preserved since then in the sanctuaries of the Initiates.

The "Watchers" reign over man during the whole period of Satya Yuga and the smaller subsequent yugas, *down to the beginning of the Third Root Race;* after which it is the Patriarchs, Heroes and Manes, the incarnated Dhyanis of a lower order, up to King Menes (of Egypt) and the human kings of other nations. In the earlier portion of this Third Race, while it was yet in its state of purity, the "Sons of Wisdom" who therein incarnated, produced by Kriyasakti a progeny called the "Sons of Ad," or "of the Fire-Mist," the "Sons of Will and Yoga," etc. They were a conscious production, as a portion of the race was already animated with the divine spark of superior spiritual intelligence. The Arhats of the "fire-mist" of the 7th Rung are but one remove from the Root-base of their Hierarchy—the highest on earth and our terrestrial chain. This "Root-base" has a name which can only be translated by several compound words into English—"the Ever-Living-Human-Banyan." "Set apart" in Archaic genesis for certain purposes, the Sons of Will and Yoga are those in whom are said to have incarnated the highest Dhyanis, "Munis and Rishis" from previous manvantaras, to form the nursery for future human adepts, on this earth and during the present cycle. They were born, so to speak, in an immaculate way, and remained, it is explained, entirely apart from the rest of mankind.

The first *Nagas*—beings wiser than Serpents—are the Sons of Will and Yoga, born before the complete separation of the sexes by

---

NOTE.—This article is largely collated from *The Secret Doctrine.*

Kriyasakti—that mysterious and divine power latent in the will of every man, and which, if not called to life, quickened and developed by Yoga-training, remains dormant and gets atrophied. By this power were created the "ancestors" (the *spiritual* forefathers) of all the subsequent and present Arhats, or Mahatmas, in a truly immaculate way. They were the "holy seed grain" of the future Saviours of Humanity.

Happily for the human race, the "Elect Race" had already become the vehicle of incarnation of the (intellectually and spiritually) highest Dhyanis before Humanity had become quite material. It was the "Golden Age" in those days of old, the age when the "gods walked the earth, and mixed freely with the mortals." Since then, the gods departed (became invisible), and later generations ended by worshipping their kingdoms—the Elements. When the last sub-races—save some lowest—of the Third Race had perished with the great Lemurian continent, "the seeds of *the Trinity of Wisdom*" had already acquired the secret of immortality on earth, that gift which allows the same great personality to step *ad libitum* from one worn-out body to another.

This race could live with equal ease in water, air or fire, for it had an unlimited control over the elements. These were the "Sons of God,"—the real Elohim. They formed the *Divine Dynasties* who governed the Third Race mankind, *i.e.,* kings and rulers who had of mortal man only his physical appearance *as it was then,* but who were Beings from spheres higher and more celestial than our own sphere will be, long manvantaras hence. It was they who imparted Nature's most weird secrets to men. There were other "Sons of Kriyasakti" produced by a second spiritual effort, but the first one has remained to this day the Seed of divine Knowledge; the One and the Supreme among the terrestrial "Sons of Wisdom." Alone a handful of the primitive men—in whom the spark of divine Wisdom burnt bright—remained the elect custodians of the Mysteries revealed to mankind by the Divine Teachers. There were those among them who remained in the *Kumaric* condition from the beginning; and tradition whispers, what the secret teachings affirm, namely, that these Elect were the germ of a Hierarchy *which never died since that period.*

"The mighty ones," the *Kabirim,* are referred to as the gods and kings of the Divine Dynasties. The Kabiri were the same as the Manus, the Rishis and our Dhyan Chohans, who incarnated in the elect of the

Third and Fourth Root Races. In their original divine natures, they were the beneficent Entities who symbolized in Prometheus, brought light to the world, and *endowed humanity with intellect and reason.* When incarnated as kings of the Divine Dynasties, the Kabiri gave the first impulse to civilizations, and directed the mind *with which they had endued* man to the invention and perfection of all the arts and sciences.

Thus the Kabiri are said to have appeared as the benefactors of men, and as such they lived for ages in the memory of nations. To them—the Kabiri or Titans—is ascribed the invention of letters (the *Devanagari,* or the alphabet and language of the gods); of laws and legislature; of architecture, as of the various modes of magic, so-called; and the medical use of plants. It is the Kabiri who are credited with having revealed, by producing corn or wheat, the great boon of agriculture. What Isis-Osiris, the once living Kabiri, has done in Egypt, that Ceres is said to have done in Sicily; *they all belong to one class.* Hermes, Orpheus, Cadmus, Asclepius, all those demi-gods and heroes, to whom is ascribed the revelation of sciences to men—are all generic names.

Not only Herodotus tells us of the marvellous dynasties of the gods that preceded the reign of mortals, followed by the dynasties of demi-gods, Heroes, and finally men; but the whole series of classics support him: Diodorus, Eratosthenes, Plato, Manetho, etc., etc., repeat the same and *never vary the order given.* From Manu, Thoth-Hermes, Oannes-Dagon, and Edris-Enoch, down to Plato and Pandores, all tell us of seven *divine* dynasties, of seven Lemurian, and seven Atlantean divisions of the Earth; of the seven primitive and dual gods who descended from their celestial abode and reign on Earth, teaching mankind Astronomy, Architecture, and all the other sciences. These Beings appear first as "gods" and Creators; then they merge in nascent man, to finally emerge as "divine Kings and rulers."

It is the pupils of those incarnated Rishis and Devas of the Third Root Race who handed their knowledge from one generation to another; to Egypt and Greece with its now lost canon of proportion, as it is the disciples of the Initiates of the Fourth, the Atlanteans, who handed it over to their *Cyclopes,* the "Sons of Cycles" or of the "Infinite," from whom the name passed to the still later generations of Gnostic priests.

Such is the testimony of *The Secret Doctrine.*

THE SPIRIT OF FREE INQUIRY

III

Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.
Thes. 5, 21

HAVING considered the middle point—the period marked by the mission of Jesus—of the millennium to which the Introductory of *The Secret Doctrine* directs our special attention, we shall next examine its farthest point—the period of Buddha's activity in India. We repeat the statement regarding the significance of this millennium: "This period, beginning with Buddha and Pythagoras, at the one end and the Neo-Platonists and Gnostics at the other, is the only focus left in History wherein converge for the last time the bright rays of light streaming from the aeons of time gone by, unobscured by the hand of bigotry and fanaticism." This period is, of course, also a vantage-point of observation for a still more remote past, always showing the unbroken transmission of the same "exhaustless doctrine of Yoga." H.P.B. in *The Secret Doctrine* thus describes "the downfall of the mysteries after which began the disappearance and final and systematic elimination from the memory of men of the real nature of initiation and the Sacred Science."

"From that time," she continues, "its teachings became Occult, and Magic sailed but too often under the venerable but frequently misleading name of Hermetic philosophy. As real Occultism had been prevalent among the mystics during the centuries that preceded our era, so Magic, or rather Sorcery, with its Occult Arts, followed the beginning of Christianity."

The missions of Jesus and of Gautama Buddha exhibit striking resemblances. There were also, of course, differences, due to necessary adaptation to the people and conditions confronting these Avatars, and though both taught the same sublime ethics, the historical drama attaching to the teachings of the two is often of an almost opposite description. In the case of Jesus, his original ethics were replaced by professed followers with dogmas such as vicarious atonement and the forgiveness of sin by priestly ukase; this resulting in the fiercest persecutions. In the case of Buddha, the result was different. As H.P.B. explained in the *Theosophical Glossary:*

> His is the only *absolutely bloodless* religion among all the existing religions: tolerant and liberal, teaching universal compassion and charity, love and self-sacrifice, poverty and contentment with one's lot, whatever it may be. No persecutions, and enforcement of faith by fire and sword, have ever disgraced it. No thunder-and-lightning-vomiting god has interfered with its chaste commandments; and if the simple, humane and philosophical code of daily life left to us by the greatest Man-Reformer ever known, should ever come to be adopted by mankind at large, then indeed an era of bliss and peace would dawn on Humanity.

Both missions of Buddha and Jesus, however, were attended by protests against entrenched authority; both taught the essential equality of all men, and that progress on the Path of spiritual attainment depended solely upon individual effort and merit. In India, the caste system had already become a hardened institution, with no one, outside of the Brahmins, having the right to study or even to read the Vedas and the Brahmanas. Buddha had learned the Brahmanical wisdom in the Upanishads, and feeling indignant because the sacred wisdom was withheld from all but the Brahmins, determined to make its essence available for everybody (*S.D.* I, 271). The deplorable effects of Brahmin exclusiveness, by the way, are succinctly described in the *Key to Theosophy* (pp. 80-81):

> In India the Brahmins, jealous of their superior knowledge, and excluding from it every caste save their own, had driven millions of men into idolatry and almost fetishism. Buddha had to give the death-blow to an exuberance of unhealthy fancy and fanatical superstition resulting from ignorance, such as has rarely been known before or after. Better a philosophical atheism than such ignorant worship. . . . He had to arrest first of all this muddy torrent of superstition to uproot *errors* before he gave out the truth.

How was Buddha to arrest this muddy torrent of superstition caused by priestly selfishness, and how was he to restore the ignorant masses "to the stature, nature, and dignity of conscious god-hood"? The "key" could in one sense be said to be the lofty ethics of all times, yet, supporting these ethics and giving them a scientific basis, Buddha also taught that Karma and Reincarnation were within the direct control of each individual. Only by such means could men be thrown back again upon their own inner divine selves, and, finally, be made fit and ready for the impartation of more abstruse and metaphysical tenets, the comprehension of which requires an awakened *Buddhi-Manas.* That this was the

true channel through which to reach "the masses" of Buddha's time is shown by its practical and beneficent results which have survived to this very day in Buddhist lands. As stated in the *Key to Theosophy:*

> It does not require metaphysics or education to make a man understand the broad truths of Karma and Reincarnation. Look at the millions of poor and uneducated Buddhists and Hindoos, to whom Karma and reincarnation are solid realities, simply because their minds have never been cramped and distorted by being forced into an unnatural groove. They have never had the innate human sense of justice perverted in them by being told to believe that their sins would be forgiven because another man had been put to death for their sakes. . . .
>
> History tells us that the masses adopted Buddhism with enthusiasm, while, as said before, the practical effect upon them of this philosophy of ethics is still shown by the smallness of the percentage of crime among Buddhist populations as compared with every other religion. The chief point is, to uproot that most fertile source of all crime and immorality—the belief that it is possible for them to escape the consequences of their own actions. Once teach them that greatest of all laws, *Karma* and *Reincarnation,* and besides feeling in themselves the true dignity of human nature, they will turn from evil and eschew it as they would a physical danger.

In Chapter XIV of the *Ocean of Theosophy,* concerned with "Cycles," Mr. Judge wrote:

> Buddha is the last of the great Avatars and is in a larger cycle than is Jesus of the Jews, for the teachings of the latter are the same as those of Buddha and tinctured with what Buddha had taught to those who instructed Jesus. . . . Buddha [was] of the ethical, religious and mystical, in which he was followed by Jesus.

The Christian churches have long cited the sublime ethics preached in the Sermon on the Mount as proof of the superiority of the *New* Dispensation. They claim that never before Jesus were such ethics known of or taught in any of the preceding religions, termed derogatorily as idolatrous, as heathen, or as pagan. As a historical fact, it was Buddha who was the first to popularize these ethics in our era. (There may be still loftier ethics which have not as yet been given to the world generally, as seems to be intimated in the Preface of *The Voice of the Silence,* where H.P.B. remarks: "The *Book of the Golden Precepts*—some of which are pre-Buddhistic while others belong to a later date—contains about ninety distinct treatises. Of these I learned about thirty-

nine by heart, years ago. . . . Nor could they all be translated and given to a world too selfish and too much attached to objects of sense to be in any way prepared to receive such exalted ethics in the right spirit. For, unless a man perseveres seriously in the pursuit of self-knowledge, he will never lend a willing ear to advice of this nature.")

The fact that Buddha was the first to deliberately popularize Theosophic ethics is emphasized in the *Key to Theosophy.* Answering the query: "But are not the ethics of Theosophy identical with those taught by Buddha?", H.P.B. says:

> Certainly, because these ethics are the soul of the Wisdom-Religion, and were once the common property of the initiates of all nations. But Buddha was the first to embody lofty ethics in his public teachings, and to make them the foundation and the very essence of his public system. It is herein that lies the immense difference between exoteric Buddhism and every other religion. For while in other religions ritualism and dogma hold the first and most important place, in Buddhism it is the ethics which have always been the most insisted upon. This accounts for the resemblance, amounting almost to identity, between the ethics of Theosophy and those of the religion of Buddha.

As an instance of the above, the golden rule and love for all, friend and foe alike, claimed to be unique to Christianity, was distinctly taught by Buddha as the *Dhammapada* makes clear:

> "He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,"—hatred in those who harbour such thoughts will never cease.
> "He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,"—hatred in those who do not harbour such thoughts will cease.
> For hatred does not cease by hatred at any time: hatred ceases by love, this is an old rule.

The personal life of Buddha is better known perhaps than the lives of most Great Sages, for he was, in a sense, the "universal adventurer," the man who had succeeded in all things equally well. Born a prince, heir to a kingly throne, as a youth a handsome athlete, Buddha yet resolved to cast in his lot with the suffering multitudes. Their woes became his, and he resolved to discover both the cause and the cure of the sorrows of the world. The rest of the story is familiar to most of us, and has been beautifully portrayed in Edwin Arnold's *Light of Asia.* Buddha first sought out all those who pretended to have the answer to his problems—the various schools of philosophy in his day, the hermits and ascetics who had withdrawn from the world, bent chiefly

on their own salvation. From none of these could Buddha receive soul-satisfying answers. Several precepts in the *Voice of the Silence* refer to Buddha's search and final enlightenment:

> Believe thou not that sitting in dark forests, in proud seclusion and apart from men; believe thou not that life on roots and plants, that thirst assuaged with snow from the great Range—believe thou not, O Devotee, that this will lead thee to the goal of final liberation.
>
> Think not that breaking bone, that rending flesh and muscle, unites thee to thy "silent Self." Think not that when the sins of thy gross form are conquered, O Victim of thy Shadows, thy duty is accomplished by nature and by man.
>
> The blessed ones have scorned to do so. The Lion of the Law, the Lord of Mercy, perceiving the true cause of human woe, immediately forsook the sweet but selfish rest of quiet wilds. From Aranyaka He became the Teacher of mankind. After Julaï had entered the Nirvana, He preached on mount and plain, and held discourses in the cities, to Devas, men and Gods.

To these verses H.P.B. appended a footnote:

> All the Northern and Southern traditions agree in showing Buddha quitting his solitude as soon as he had resolved the problem of life—*i.e.,* received the inner enlightenment — and teaching mankind publicly.

Buddha's devotion to the spirit of free inquiry is plainly evident in his public teaching of "The Noble Eightfold Path." It is: "Right seeing, right willing, right speaking, right behaving, right living, right concentrating, right meditating." Here is no arbitrary code of conduct to be mechanically performed. Man is thrown back on himself and his inherent perception of the difference between right and wrong, between good and evil. It is *this* knowledge which makes man, man; it is this knowledge and this power to choose between two opposite paths which distinguishes him from the beast. Buddha's method and teaching appealed directly to man's own higher *manasic* Spirit, which could only be awakened through the highest ethics. This was Buddha's method of preparing men's minds for the reception and understanding of ever greater and deeper knowledge—the method, apparently, of every Avatar and Great Teacher, and constituting as well the lines laid down by Masters, by H.P.B. and W.Q.J. in the present Theosophical Movement.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WE all admit and know the value of those who reach revolutionary, inspiring conclusions about the nature of man without the benefit of church or religious group. The ideas and convictions they hold are truly their own. How much should we, who are constantly surrounded by philosophical ideas and earnestly studious people, depend on and be influenced by the Lodge, its books for study and its members?

(*a*) We should be dependent on the Lodge only to the extent that it helps us to be independent thinkers. To depend on something so that we fail to come to conclusions on our own is a dangerous thing. In this case, a "Theosophist" would simply be a religionist with a different label, professing ideas instilled rather than discovered. There is nothing we can possibly know, however, which someone before us hasn't already known and helped *us* to know. We therefore must try to see if these ideas naturally become "ours" while also evidently the "property" of many others.

We probably often develop a habit of listening, recognizing what we hear, and failing to really weigh the thoughts to discover the logic or soundness of the idea. Perhaps we should first take an idea as a *possibility,* work on the assumptions behind its statement, and then find out if it is true. Once we have proved it to ourselves, it is "ours."

Actually, as long as our relationship to the Lodge is one of dependence, there can never be any "revolutionary, inspiring conclusions" on our part. It is only when we assume our share of the burden of independent thought that we can share with and be worthy of the greatest minds, the Masters of Wisdom.

(*b*) Students studying the philosophy naturally face a self-imposed danger of simply accepting Theosophy without seeing its rationale. Certainly there may be, at the outset, the conviction that "here is truth." But the knowing of it requires daily practice. If someone else in the Lodge is firmly convinced of a truth, it is no reason why we ourselves should accept it. However, we may note their conviction and investigate for ourselves. We know that Theosophy rests on what are often called "the three truths"—though H. P. Blavatsky called them propositions. Oftentimes people accept them uncompromisingly, and depend

on the letter of the philosophy rather than exercising independent judgment and practicing intelligent introspection. The third proposition of H.P.B.'s Theosophy shows that dependence must be upon oneself—to earn our own knowledge by "self-induced and self-devised efforts." The "path varies with the pilgrim," and individual convictions are the result of ideas and knowledge gained which are peculiar to the "pilgrim." As we go along, though, we develop and express further recognitions of interdependence.

Theosophy is not seeking for indulgent agreement to its tenets. This attitude leads to dogmatism, because one gradually relinquishes the independent exercise of thought. His energies go toward either accepting or rejecting other people's thoughts. One need only look back along the corridors of the past to see how people have allowed others to convince them of perverted expressions of the truth. There is a passage well worth study in Robert Crosbie's *Friendly Philosopher* regarding dogmatism (p. 114).

(*c*) A close scrutiny of the Declaration of the Lodge should help us to determine the influence exerted by, and the dependence felt on, the Lodge, its studies and members. The Declaration states that the Lodge's "work and . . . end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the Philosophy of Theosophy." This statement is a clear indication that the books and studies were geared by the founders of the movement toward the practical everyday application of the truths so that the student will gain "a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood." The Theosophical Movement has always been concerned with the principles and basic laws of nature rather than with the tangents of individual opinion.

(*d*) The most "rugged" individualists and free-thinkers do not, it is true, take their ideas wholesale from a group or institution—but their minds are nonetheless inspired by "outside influences." The American Transcendentalists were students of Asiatic and European religions and philosophies, especially the *Upanishads* and *Bhagavad-Gita;* Mr. Gandhi was an admirer of Thoreau and Tolstoy; and Tolstoy, himself, was a student of the Bible. These and others have had the same contacts as millions of other people. The difference must lie in what they do with great ideas once they enter the mind.

We may admire more the ability to think than the thought arrived at. This attitude or ability to search, compare, relate and translate is

the result of practice—thinking through each action and idea until it is related to the Real Cause, to the laws guiding the universe and to the evolutionary scheme in nature. Following this procedure, we gradually acquire not just a collection of ideas but an honest, logical, sincere and strong (though gentle) way of living and looking at things.

H.P.B.'s mission was to help create free thinkers through the promulgation of Theosophical truths.

How can one develop a greater love for humanity and extend sympathy and understanding for those we do not see?

True love based on understanding has no geographical boundaries, and gentle thoughts of service and consideration will have powerful effects the world over, and will influence beneficently even those we do not see.

If the questioner is concerned with such matters as international politics and economics, then some effort must be made to understand basic issues concerning practical matters among the peoples of the world. Sometimes countries impose tariff barriers for purely selfish motives, or confiscate foreign goods that compete with the domestic market. Unimpeded trade among the nations of the world is often barred by ardent nationalists who exalt "self-sufficiency" to further military preparedness. The effect of this attitude on other countries is conveniently ignored, but the repercussions must necessarily affect all.

Attitude and motive are most important. Karma presents us with enough people at hand on whom to lavish our love, without our bending over backwards to give personal largesse abroad. But however excellent the invisible effects of "good attitudes" are, we can well make, in addition, a strong effort to understand and adopt courageously nonprovincial attitudes toward such issues as international trade and economics. By such attitudes, based on the universal good and supported by intelligent distribution of goods, perhaps we can ultimately achieve the community among nations we profess to desire.

In a recent meeting it was said we should live as souls. How would one, unfamiliar with the Theosophical concept of the nature of man, wish to live a "life of the soul" when what he is able to perceive with his senses is that happy living concerns the tangible part of his nature, the body and its desires?

Almost all men, whether familiar or not with the "Theosophical concept of the nature of man," at times aspire to forms of expression transcending the bounds of personal pleasure-seeking. And it is that same aspect of man's nature which desires to support a cause greater than self, be it religious, political, or humanitarian, which also supports his wish for a higher life. Thus, in dealing with a wish to live a "life of soul," we are dealing with an idealism latent in all men. Of course, it is obvious, as the question suggests, that this potential becomes more easily manifest when nurtured in a climate of ideas such as study of Theosophy affords.

The question has other ramifications. We may think not only of the individual's attempt to live the life of soul, but also of those unusual men who have devoted their lives to the establishment of a better "social context" for the "souls" of others. Many men have sacrificed themselves in unceasing labor to achieve a society in which equality and freedom of conscience are truly respected. Thus while some have not consciously striven towards personal asceticism, they have nevertheless directed their energies from a *basis of soul,* and encouraged other men to do likewise. Such social reformers as Thomas Paine, Lincoln, and Eugene Debs are but a few who belong in this company. All these, and others, known and unknown, have supported the Theosophical Movement.

No, the larger portion of the Western world today does not *wish* to live a life of soul, but it is the natural responsibility of those whom Ortega called the "natural aristocracy" to stir the average man to greater heights of expression and self-consciousness. Thus, whether under formal Theosophical auspices or not, we have the workings and interaction of what is called in the Declaration of Theosophy School "the laws of Brotherhood." It must be realized, however, that progress in terms of the awakening of man's moral and spiritual nature is not always easily discernible. (The United States has been called, with some justice, "the greatest materialistic nation in history" and the rest of Western civilization seems to follow suit according to its capacity, but many impressive signs of new ethical awareness are also present.)

It should also be mentioned that as there is a kind of "happy living" for man in regard to "the tangible part of his nature, the body and its desires," there is also happiness for one who pursues the meaningful path of soul experience.

"THE LOST ATLANTIS"

MANY a time Atlantis is spoken of under another name, one unknown to modern commentators. It stands to reason that neither the name of Lemuria nor even of Atlantis are the real archaic names of the lost continents, but have been adopted for the sake of clarity. Most of the correct names of the countries and continents of both are given in the Puranas. The power of names is great, and was known since the first men were instructed by the divine masters. As Solon had studied Atlantis, he translated the "Atlantean" names into names devised by himself. In connection with the continent of Atlantis, it is desirable to bear in mind that the accounts which have come down to us from the old Greek writers contain a confusion of statements, some referring to the Great Continent, and others to Plato's "Atlantis," the small island of Poseidonis. It has become customary to take them all as referring to the latter only, but that this is incorrect is evident from the incompatibility of the various statements as to the size, etc., of Atlantis.

To make a difference between Lemuria and Atlantis, the ancient writers referred to the latter as the Northern or Hyperborean Atlantis, and to the former as the Southern. The Atlantic portion of Lemuria, which was a gigantic land, was the geological basis of what is generally known as Atlantis. The latter, indeed, must be regarded rather as a development of the Atlantic prolongation of Lemuria, than as an entirely new land mass upheaved to meet the special requirements of the Fourth Root Race. The Fourth Race Atlanteans were developed from a nucleus of Northern Lemurian Third Race men, centered, roughly speaking, toward a point of land in what is now the mid-Atlantic Ocean. In those days, large portions of the *future* continent of Atlantis were yet part and parcel of the Ocean floors. Their continent was formed by the coalescence of many islands and peninsulas which were upheaved in the ordinary course of time and became ultimately the true home of the great Race known as the Atlanteans. Hence the first Atlanteans, the earliest pioneers of the Fourth Race, were born on the Lemurian continent.

NOTE.—This article is collated from standard Theosophical works.

Atlantis produced the first *physically* human man, whose origin began with the last sub-races of the Third Root Race. With the Fourth Race we reach the first *purely* human period, the first progeny of *semi-divine* man after his separation into sexes—hence the first-begotten and humanly born mortals. Those who were hitherto semi-divine beings, imprisoned in bodies which were human only in appearance, became physiologically changed. Herodotus recounts the tradition of the Atlantes—a people of Western Africa which gave its name to Mount Atlas—who were vegetarians, and "whose sleep was never disturbed by dreams." If the Atlanteans never had their sleep disturbed by dreams, it was because that particular tradition is concerned with the *earliest* Atlanteans, whose physical frame and brain were not yet sufficiently consolidated, in the physiological sense, to permit the nervous centers to act during sleep.

All ancient writings—prose and poetry—are full of the reminiscences of the Lemuro-Atlanteans, the first *physical* races, though the Third and Fourth in number. Hesiod records the tradition about the men of the Age of Bronze, whom Jupiter had made out of ashwood, and who had hearts harder than diamond. Clad in bronze from head to foot, they passed their lives in fighting. Monstrous in size, endowed with a terrible strength, invincible arms and hands descended from their shoulders, says the poet. Such were the giants of the first physical races. The "one-eyed" Cyclopes, the giants fabled as the sons of Coelus and Terra, were the last three sub-races of the Lemurians, the "one eye" referring to the Wisdom Eye; for the two front eyes were developed as organs only in the beginning of the Fourth Race. But we can easily believe that the Titans and Cyclopes of old really belonged to the Fourth (Atlantean) Race, and that all the subsequent legends and allegories found in the Hindu Puranas and the Greek Hesiod and Homer, were based on the hazy reminiscences of real Titans—men of a superhuman, tremendous physical power, which enabled them to defend themselves, and hold at bay the gigantic monsters of the Mesozoic and early Cenozoic times—and of actual Cyclopes, *three-eyed mortals.*

The possession of a physical third eye, we are told, was enjoyed by the men of the Third Race down to nearly the middle period of the Third Sub-Race of the Fourth Root Race, when the consolidation and perfection of the human frame made it disappear from the outward anatomy of man. Psychically and spiritually, however, its mental and

visual perceptions lasted till nearly the end of the Fourth Race, when its functions, owing to the materiality and depraved condition of mankind, died out altogether before the submersion of the bulk of the Atlantean continent. The "eye of Siva" did not become entirely atrophied before the close of the Fourth Race.

What was the Religion of the Third and Fourth Races? In the common acceptance of the term, neither the Lemurians, nor yet their progeny, the Atlanteans, had any, as they knew no dogma, nor had they to believe on *faith.* No sooner had the mental eye of man been opened to understanding, than the Third Race felt itself one with the ever-present as the ever to be unknown and invisible ALL, the One Universal Deity. Endowed with divine powers, and feeling in himself his *inner* God, each felt he was a Man-God in his nature, though an animal in his physical self. The struggle between the two began from the very day they tasted of the fruit of the Tree of Wisdom, a struggle for life between the spiritual and the psychic, the psychic and the physical. Those who conquered the lower principles by obtaining mastery over the body, joined the "Sons of Light." Those who fell victims to their lower natures, became the slaves of matter. From "Sons of Light and Wisdom" they ended by becoming the "Sons of Darkness." They had fallen in the battle of mortal life with Life Immortal, and all those so fallen became the seed of the future generations of Atlanteans.

Thus the first Atlanteans, born on the Lemurian continent, separated from their earliest tribes into the righteous and the unrighteous: into those who worshipped the one unseen Spirit of Nature, the ray of which man feels within himself—or the Pantheists; and those who offered fanatical worship to the Spirits of the Earth, the dark Cosmic, anthropomorphic Powers, with whom they had made alliance. It was the Atlanteans who became the first "Sacrificers" to the god of matter. Such was the secret and mysterious origin of all the subsequent and modern religions, especially of the worship of the later Hebrews for their tribal god.

The Continent of Atlantis at its height covered the whole of the North and South Atlantic regions, as well as portions of the North and South Pacific, and had islands even in the Indian Ocean (relics of Lemuria). The India of the prehistoric ages was doubly connected with the two Americas, India being the *center* of the seven great continents

before the submersion of the *great* continent of Atlantis. A traveler, starting from the South, could have at one time walked over from Siam, crossed the Polynesian Islands and trudged into any part of the continent of South America. Again, a pedestrian from the North might then have reached, hardly wetting his feet, the Alaskan peninsula, through Manchuria, across the *future* Gulf of Tartary, the Kurile and Aleutian Islands, thence into North America.

A Master wrote: "The Fourth Race had its period of the highest civilization." In the early part of the Tertiary age, the most brilliant civilization the world has ever known flourished. The civilization of the Atlanteans was greater even than that of the Egyptians.

The Sanskrit language, as now known, was not spoken by the Atlanteans. The predominating element in Atlantis was a language which has now survived but in the dialects of some American tribes, and in the Chinese speech of the inland Chinamen, the mountainous tribes of Kivang-ze—a language which was an admixture of the agglutinative and the monosyllabic, as it would be called by modern philologists. It was, in fact, the language of the "Red-Yellow" second or middle geological stock. "What would you say to our affirmation that the Chinese—the aborigines who belong in their unallied nationality wholly to the highest and last branch of the Fourth Race—reached their highest civilization when the Fifth had hardly appeared in Asia?" Even the historical works of China are full of such reminiscences about the Fourth Race. In *Shoo-King,* anyone can read in the French translation, "When the Mao-tse"—that race, explains the Annotator—"which had retired in days of old to the rocky caves, and the descendants of whom are said to be still found in the neighborhood of Canton. . . ." The surviving handful of these inland Chinese are of very high stature.

The Atlanteans were giants, whose physical beauty and strength reached their climax, in accordance with evolutionary law, toward the middle period of the fourth sub-race. The records speak of their giant intellect and their giant size. They built great images, 27 feet high—the size of their bodies. The statues found by Cook on Easter Island measured almost all 27 feet high and eight feet across the shoulders. The days when matter would be in its full sway on earth and man would reach the apex of physical development in stature and *animality,* came to pass during the period of the middle point of their race. Since then, man began decreasing in stature, strength and years.

Writing was perfectly known to the Atlanteans. It was invented by them, and not at all by the Phoenicians. It was from the Fourth Race that the early Aryans got their knowledge of the "bundle of wonderful things," the Sabha and Mayasabha, mentioned in the Mahabharata, the gift of Mayasur to the Pandavas. It is from them that they learned aeronautics, Viwan Vidya (the knowledge of flying in air-vehicles), and therefore their great arts in meteorography and meteorology.

The Secret Doctrine assigns from four to five million years between the incipient and the final evolution of the Fourth Root Race, on the Lemuro-Atlantean continent. In the *Eocene* age, even in its very first part, the great cycle of the Fourth Race men had already reached its highest point and the great continent, the father of nearly all the present continents, showed the first symptoms of sinking. Atlantis sank, and its chief portions had disappeared, before the end of the *Miocene* period.

(From *Histoire des Vierges*): "One of the most ancient legends of India, preserved in the temples by oral and written tradition, relates that several hundred thousand years ago, there existed in the Pacific Ocean an immense continent which was destroyed by geologic upheaval. The high plateaux of Hindustan and Asia, according to this hypothesis, would only have been represented in those days by great islands contiguous to the central continent. . . . According to the Brahmans, this country had attained a high civilization, and the peninsula of Hindustan, enlarged by the displacement of the waters at the time of the grand cataclysm, has but continued the chain of the primitive traditions born in this place. These traditions give the name of *Rutas* to the people who inhabited this immense continent, and *from their speech was derived the Sanskrit.*"

The Hindus possess recorded observations from the date of the first Great Flood within the Aryans, *historical* memory. One million years are allowed for our present Aryan Fifth Race, the first sub-race of which witnessed the doom of the last of the populations of the giant Atlanteans, that which submerged the last portions of Atlantis, 850,000 years ago. *The Secret Doctrine* declares that most of the later island Atlanteans perished in this interval between 850,000 and 700,000 years ago, and that the Aryans were 200,000 years old when the first great island or continent was submerged. But the destruction of the famous island of *Ruta,* in the later Pliocene times, and the

smaller one of Daitya, must not be confounded with the submersion of the main continent of Atlantis during the Miocene period.

After the submersion of Ruta (850,000 years ago) there was no great submersion until the day of Plato's Atlantis, or *Poseidonis,* which belongs to historical times. Plato's Atlantis perished between water below and fire above; its great mountain vomiting flames all the while. The "fire vomiting monster" (the peak of Teneriffe?) survived alone out of the ruins of the unfortunate island. A number of small islands scattered around Poseidonis had been vacated, in consequence of earthquakes, long before the final catastrophe. The last of the islands of the Great Atlantis—Poseidonis, which lasted until about 12,000 years ago—alone remained in the memory of man, thanks to some written records.

Mythology

By such slow aggregation has mythology grown from the first. The very nursery tales of this generation, were the nursery tales of primeval races. They migrate from east to west, and again from west to east; now expanded into the "tale divine" of bards, now shrunk into a popular rhyme. This is an approach to that universal language which men have sought in vain. This fond reiteration of the oldest expressions of truth by the latest posterity, content with slightly and religiously retouching the old material, is the most impressive proof of a common humanity.

The hidden significance of these fables which is sometimes thought to have been detected, the ethics running parallel to the poetry and history, are not so remarkable as the readiness with which they may be made to express a variety of truths. As if they were the skeletons of still older and more universal truths than any whose flesh and blood they are for the time made to wear. . . .

To some extent, mythology is only the most ancient history and biography. So far from being false or fabulous in the common sense, it contains only enduring and essential truth, the I and you, the here and there, the now and then, being omitted. Either time or rare wisdom writes it.

—Henry D. Thoreau

THE QUALITY OF THE DAY

> It is something to be able to paint a particular picture, or to carve a statue, and so to make a few objects beautiful; but it is far more glorious to paint and carve the very atmosphere and medium through which we look, which morally we can do. To affect the quality of the day, that is the highest of arts.
>
> —THOREAU

MAN, the Chooser, stands in the midst of a double set of impressions—those that come from above, from *Higher Manas,* and those that come from the lower, fleeting personality. And according to the direction of his gaze—that is to say, according to which of these two sets of impressions he chooses to entertain—so is the tenor of the day determined. So, in fact, is the quality of every event either enhanced or debased. Through the prism of *Higher Manas* comes light, courage and good cheer; through the prism of the lower comes darkness, suspicion and doubt.

How easy it is to succumb to the tendencies of the personal mind, and to lower the quality of our days! How easy to fall into the habit of fault-finding, of seeing only the dark side of things, events and people, and of complaining that the world is not what it should be! Who has not had the experience, in some moment of detachment, of observing oneself in an attitude of complaint, and of resolving to rise above it? Moments of such clear-seeing detachment, unfortunately, are all too rare. For unless a person cultivates in himself a spirit of self-watchfulness, resolving to control the polarity of his mind, ill-humour and moroseness are likely to become chronic fixations, the individual himself being totally unaware of his affliction.

Does it seem to us that people sometimes deliberately go out of their way to annoy us? Do we have the feeling, on occasion, that events conspire to defeat our plans, and that the Law of Life itself works to obstruct our path of progress? Are there moments when life seems cruel and unjust? If so, then such are times for soul-searching, when the unhappy pilgrim should count his blessings, one by one, as admonished in the song book. So doing, he will discover that life is not all darkness, as had been supposed, nor is Karma a god of wrath and punishment, nor do friends and associates find any pleasure in harassing or obstructing his path. For the first time in his life, he will realize per-

haps that he, himself, by his dismal attitude of mind, is the sole cause of his grief, that unconsciously to himself, he has been directing his gaze downward, toward darkness, thus overlooking the more cheerful aspects of life and nature.

Every human being owes it to himself, as well as to his fellow men, to analyze critically the habits and disposition of his mind. How many individuals, during the course of the day, seek for an opportunity of standing aside from the turmoil, and viewing their thoughts and feelings with impartiality? How many take a moment for detached contemplation, so as to see themselves objectively, and in fresher light? For unless one rises to the position of soul and uses the light of his higher consciousness to evaluate the forces of his inner being, there is always danger that he will become enveloped in darkness, and will pattern his thinking after the age in which he lives. Unless one looks *within* for the source of his complaints, and affixes responsibility *there,* he will naturally look without, blaming everything and everybody except himself.

He who would lend a hand toward the betterment of the race is tasked to elevate the quality of his own life. Just as the *Manus,* or Divine Men, at the beginning of the great "Day" called Manvantara, establish a certain rate of vibration which They maintain throughout the progress of the whole period, so ought the individual soul to begin each day with the highest view possible—working with causes instead of effects, searching out the constructive aspects of events and conditions instead of dwelling on the dark side only, and seeing friends and associates in their best and noblest mien. This does not mean that one need close his eyes to reality, or abandon the exercise of discrimination, but to be mindful of the fact that appearances deceive, and that externals, whether of men or events, never mirror forth the soul at its true worth. Right discrimination demands the assumption of the high moral position of the soul, seeing beyond personalities, prejudices and forms, to principles and motives.

What right have I, for example, to blame another person who, from appearances, seems not to live up to the trusts which I think are incumbent upon him? What have I to do with the shortcomings of my neighbor, or with his apparent inability to practice the noble virtues? What possible justification can any man find for feeling indignant or revengeful toward another—because, perchance, that other person is tempera-

mental and inconsiderate, or even unkind? Nature does not impose upon one man the task of correcting or adjusting the life of another. Adjustment is the work of *Karma,* which is universal and impartial—and by attempting to intervene, one only presumes to a power he does not possess, to a wisdom greater than that of the Gods themselves, who never interfere. By feelings of indignation, one only proves to the world that he himself possesses faults worse than those he criticizes in others.

Men see what they look for. Who looks for imperfections, sees imperfections; who looks for virtues and the redeeming features of any situation, sees these. The power of imagination, says H. P. Blavatsky, plays a far greater part in the life and perceptions of men than we are likely to suppose. If it is true, as she says, that fear and imagination are the causes of two-thirds of the physical diseases that afflict mankind, must this not apply also, at least in some measure, to the mental and psychic ailments of the race, and to the doubts and suspicions that darken the lives of men in general? Imagination is the master draftsman who, under the tutelage of the mind, models all things and beings into the likeness of the ideas held. Begin the day with an attitude of gloom, and so the day becomes! Think evilly of a person, and everything that person says or does will be dressed up by the imagination so as to justify the position assumed. A single unkind thought, under the fructifying power of the lower mind, may provide material enough for the lifetime condemnation of a friend—while just as easily, he could have been visualized and sketched in the likeness of the soul.

Be charitable, cheerful, and kind. This is the teaching of all the Adepts. For these spiritual qualities, acting on the plane of *Higher Manas,* tend to elevate the consciousness, and to awaken higher feelings and attributes in others. It is only on the plane of spiritual causation, not on the plane of effects, that help of real value can be given or received. It is only through mutual respect and agreement, never through condemnation or argument, that harmonious brotherly relationships can be established. Krishna, following this principle in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* addresses his disciple, Arjuna, only in terms of highest respect and affection: O best of embodied men, O thou of mighty arms, O conqueror of wealth, O sinless one, etc., etc. One might be inclined to argue that Arjuna was undeserving of these noble designations, that he lacked some of the virtues here ascribed to him by the Teacher. Per-

haps he did so lack on the lower personal planes of his being, but what has this to do with the hidden life of the Ego, on the plane of motive and aspiration? Is not all human action involved in fault, even as fire is surrounded by smoke? Krishna, with the eye of wisdom, always looks beyond the unreal to the real, beyond the imperfections of the personality to the motives and effort of the God within.

Socrates, besides being a philosopher, is said also to have been a sculptor. While chiselling away one day on a block of granite, a disciple approached him and said: "My, Socrates, what a beautiful form you are creating." "I am not creating the form," replied the teacher. "The form was already there, perfect, before I began. I am only knocking off the rough edges so you can see it."

Are not all men sculptors, in this sense—chiselling away at their imperfections, so that the glory of the inner God may show through? Shall we look only at the imperfections of our neighbors, at the rough stony edges of their personalities, as they fall under the blows of the chisel—or shall we look for, and encourage, the Real? Man *is* what he aspires and desires to do, says Robert Crosbie, not his inabilities to perform.

The Mahatma alone stands at all times above duality. With consciousness centered in the Self, the Mahatma is not swayed by the influence of the *opposites,* though he uses them for purposes of experience and evaluation. And if he is thus free and uninfluenced by the impressions that beset the tranquility of ordinary men, it is because he has reached that state by personal effort and merit. Choosing to look ever upward, the Mahatma has constructed within Himself a fortress of spiritual power, an asylum of moral stability. From this vantage point of clear-seeing, consistently maintained, he determines *from within* the quality and nature of each event. And every human being can likewise do the same to the extent that he makes an effort to do so. Through personal effort and devotion, man has the power to determine the quality of each day, to lift himself out of the vale of darkness, and to brighten the lives of those around him.

> I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestionable ability of man to elevate his life by a conscious endeavor . . . Every man is tasked to make his life, even in its details, worthy of the contemplation of his most elevated and critical hour. (Thoreau.)

ON THE LOOKOUT

Survey on Modern Hypnotism

In "Hypnotism, and Its Relation to Other Modes of Fascination"—a series of questions and answers published by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for December, 1890 (republished in Theosophy 17: 162; 31: 4), the first question is: "What is Hypnotism: how does it differ from Animal Magnetism (or Mesmerism)?" H.P.B. begins her answer:

> Hypnotism is the new scientific name for the old ignorant 'superstition' variously called 'fascination' and 'enchantment.' It is an antiquated *lie* transformed into a modern *truth*. The fact is there, but the scientific explanation of it is still wanting.

A perusal of *Experimental Hypnosis,* edited by Leslie M. LeCron (Macmillan Company, 1952) shows this statement *still* to be correct—facts, facts, and ever more *facts* are there, "but the scientific explanation . . . is still wanting."

Many modern students of Hypnosis also recognize this lack; and one of them, W. D. Furneaus (Psychology Department, University of London) says:

> One of the main inadequacies of nearly all attempts to evolve a theoretical framework for hypnosis lies in the fact that no attempt is made to give an operational definition either of hypnosis or of the concepts in terms of which it is to be explained.
>
> Evidence has been produced in favor of the thesis that there is no general trait of suggestibility but rather several more or less independent suggestibilities—those who were suggestible in one way not necessarily being so in others.

The contributors of the articles in *Experimental Hypnosis* are members of The Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, which "was formed in 1949 for the purpose of bringing together into one scientific group those professional workers utilizing hypnosis in experimental and clinical areas." Membership is by invitation, with the highest standards as a requisite. The conclusions reached by this body, therefore, have the seal of scientific confirmation; they also often duplicate or parallel those of *Isis Unveiled.*

"Ancients" and "Yogins" Knew Something After All

Of chief "trend" interest to students, perhaps, are the many modifications of the scientific opinions prevalent in H.P.B.'s day—such as that of calling all evidence a "lie" save that which the scientists themselves have collected. S. J. Van Pelt, for instance, in discussing the relationship of cardiac action to hypnosis, accepts as "fact" the long-denied phenomena of suspended animation:

> It is well known that certain Indian fakirs and holy men are able to so slow the circulation by autosuggestion or self-hypnosis that the pulse becomes imperceptible and they apparently die. In this condition they may be buried for some considerable time, yet recover perfectly. The feat has been attested to by British physicians when performed under controlled conditions.
>
> The experiments illustrate the point that hypnosis is akin to the waking state and is definitely not sleep. Suggestions of cardiac changes during ordinary sleep would produce no such results.

This same recognition of truth in "Ancient Magic" is particularly evident in another essay of the LeCron collection, by Griffith W. Williams, Psychologist at Rutgers University. Dr. Williams suggests that the trance condition is so "natural" to man and so common that we fail to recognize it in its ordinary manifestations: reverie, the light trance induced by church ritual, music, poetry, fishing, autodriving, etc. In respect to hypnosis he says:

> Owing to neglect of historical perspective, hypnosis is uncritically assumed to begin with Franz Anton Mesmer, but to find its origin would necessitate peering into the gloom that precedes the dawn of history. Hypnosis, it seems, is as old as man.

(The student of Theosophy will find suggestive correlations to this statement by referring to H.P.B.'s explanation of the allegory of Kandu, *S.D.* II, 174-5.)

ESP: a Modern Term for Magic

LeCron, in introducing Dr. Rhine's article, "Extrasensory Perception and Hypnosis," further illustrates the trend toward recognition of "hidden powers in man":

> Hypnosis has long been associated with magic and the esoteric, and most scientists feel that ESP is largely a magical or related matter. Many scientific workers in hypnosis are strongly of the opinion that

> hypnosis is still too closely associated with magic in the minds of the public for it to be discussed in connection with ESP. The editor feels that it is a mistake for scientists of any persuasion to be of such closed mind. If there is such a capacity as ESP, it should be subject to proof, and only carefully controlled research will provide proof. If ESP can be shown to have no validity, disproof would also be of the utmost value. At present there seems to be a preponderance of evidence which seems valid and cannot lightly be dismissed.

(Incidentally, Dr. Rhine states that "hypnosis can be seen to be not the kind of thing we need at this stage in the ESP research . . .")

TRANCE: "CONCENTRATION"

Developing the idea that all paranormal psychic states must be considered in relation to each other, Dr. Williams compares the hypnotic trance and the Yoga trance:

> In view of what is known of deep hypnosis, it is at least conceivable that the Yoga term "concentration" can best be approximated by the term "trance." It is, however, far from permissible to assume their equivalence even though the English term "concentration" is so clearly unsuitable. . . .
>
> The phenomenon known as "rapport" in hypnosis has its equivalent in Yoga sense withdrawal. To quote further from Behanan, the yogin "is responsive only to those stimuli that have a spiritual value. . . . The spiritual exercises of Western mystics closely resemble those of the yogin, for . . . the (Hindu) mystic integrates all the forces of the mind into a unity and reconciles himself with the totality of experience as a spiritual system." If the determining conditions are right, "deep hypnosis may lead to an unexpected expansion of the faculties of the mind or the acquisition of supernormal powers."

Some confusion obviously here exists, from a Theosophical point of view—revealed in the last sentence. The "acquisition of supernormal powers," for instance, is never possible in Hatha or *passive* Yoga—in this case, the equivalent of the "hypnotic state" discussed. Genuine "powers," according to H.P.B. are *will* induced through active or Raja Yoga, proceeding basically from moral inspiration. Yet, wonder of wonders, "Yoga" receives recognition as something better than nonsense!

METHOD—AND MOTIVE

Theosophists are chiefly familiar with warnings against hypnotism, such as, for example, the statement in *The Secret Doctrine* II, 641:

> One of the Seven Accursed Sciences is now before the public, pregnant with danger in the present as for the future. The modern name for it is HYPNOTISM. In the ignorance of the seven principles, and used by scientific and ignorant materialists, it will soon become SATANISM in the full acceptation of the term.

H.P.B., on the other hand, even when decrying the use of Hypnotism because of (1) its physical effects (as brought out by Mr. Judge in "Hypnotism and Theosophy"), (2) the effect of the continued post-hypnotic influence of the operator ("Dangers of Hypnotism"), and (3) the danger of "black magic" ("Hypnotism, and . . . Fascination"), still shows a great tolerance for those who use it with a humanitarian motive. For example (answering a question about a suggestion given by thought), she says:

QUALIFICATION

> Unless the 'suggestion' made is for the good only of the subject, and entirely free from any selfish motive, a suggestion *by thought* is an act of *black magic* still more pregnant with evil consequences than a *spoken* suggestion. It is always wrong and unlawful to deprive a man of his free-will, *unless for his own or Society's good;* and even the former has to be done with great discrimination.
>
> Q. Is it wise to hypnotize a patient not only out of a disease, but out of a habit, such as drinking or lying?
>
> Ans. It is an act of charity and kindness, and this is next to wisdom.

This emphatic distinction between method and motive is essential to a consideration of "Experimental Hypnosis," where we find that the motivations of the so-called "experimental" hypnotists seem to be in sharp contrast to those of the clinical therapists. (This same distinction is to be noted between the academic and clinical psychologists—as has been mentioned before in Lookout, where it has been pointed out that those whose genuine concern is for the patient's welfare make the best possible use of all methods.)

It is especially interesting to note that psychoanalysts have now largely abandoned hypnotism as a means of eradicating a habit or relieving a symptom. They have themselves discovered what H.P.B. was well aware of—that while hypnotism used with the best of motives might be "next to wisdom," it is not necessarily the highest wisdom.

Hypnotism, though, as H.P.B. shows in the above quotation, is not "black magic" when the suggestion is made "*only* for the good of the

subject" and tempered with "*great* discrimination." Hypnotism becomes a step toward "satanism" *when* used by "ignorant materialists" and experimenters who are more interested in the mechanics of the laboratory than in the effect on the subject.

Indiscriminate Hypnosis Dangerous

Throughout *Experimental Hypnosis* great stress is laid on the necessity of keeping the practice of hypnosis in the hands of those doctors and scientists who are adequately trained in the techniques of induction and who recognize a responsibility to the subject. For example:

> "A subject needs to be protected at all times as a personality possessed of rights, privileges, and privacies and recognized as being placed in a seemingly vulnerable position" (M. H. Erickson, Experimentalist.)
>
> "The physician, using hypnosis in his professional capacity, must respect the individuality of his patient, or else public resistance to hypnosis will again be aroused and the public will lose the benefits which are to be derived from this technique." (Dr. Abramson, Obstetrician.)
>
> "We look upon the hypnotist, first, as a teacher whose duty it is to help and to instruct the patient to gain that degree of abstraction known as hypnosis and, secondly, then to give suggestions to the patient which eventually enable the subject to control himself. In the words of the layman, we believe that through training under hypnosis the person can learn to control his body by his mind. In these days of increasing knowledge of psychosomatic medicine, there seems to be no escape from the position that there is definite unconscious mental control of the body, although this concept may be stated in different terms which are more acceptable to many scientists." (Dr. Abramson and Wm. T. Heron.)

Levels of Hypnotic Trance

Dr. Williams compares the levels or various depths of hypnosis to an iceberg; and Dr. Whitlow names them as follows: light trance, medium trance, deep trance, deeper trance, stuporous trance, suspended animation. Dr. Whitlow also describes one technique "in order to *warn* the unwary not to submit to it. It cannot be overemphasized that the method described here is one which is extremely dangerous for use by lay hypnotists. It is definitely one for the physician only." This method utilizes pressure on the nerves behind the earlobes, and *can* be fatal to the subject if a certain cardiac condition exists. It is considered so

dangerous that there was much discussion whether or not to publish it; but because there were known instances of this method having been used in stage performances (with no known fatalities, however), it was finally decided that the value of *warning* would offset the danger of making the technique available.

Constructive Uses of Hypnosis

At the present time, light and medium hypnosis is rather extensively used in dentistry, obstetrics; and deeper hypnosis in psychoanalysis. In obstetrics this technique is used in order to minimize fear and induce relaxation; in hypnodontics, there is the additional objective of inducing local anæsthesia. In hypnoanalysis, the trance is used as a time-saver only—in order to get to the root of the trouble as quickly as possible. The psychoanalysts who contributed articles to the book and who discussed the work now being done in that field have followed Freud's lead and have dispensed with hypnotic suggestion to relieve "symptoms." (See Theosophy 41: 237.) Suggestions, when given, are such as to make the recollection of disturbing psychic residue come more easily to light so that therapy can later take place.

"Automatic Writing and Hypnosis"

This essay, by Anita M. Mühl, M.D., describes how easy and how apparently logical it is for modern practitioners to move from "analysis" to "suggestion." Dr. Mühl writes:

> After the various personalities have "written themselves out," it is possible through hypnosis to direct the patient consciously to remember every part of the submerged material. This is often extremely painful to the patient, therefore in directing the patient to remember, the direction should be given to remember and accept the memory without too great emotional stress. This relieves a great deal of unnecessary strain and tension. The next hypnotic suggestion is for the patient *consciously and subconsciously* to reject useless, destructive elements of the personality and *consciously and subconsciously to accept* the useful, creative elements. The next hypnotic suggestion is for the patient continuously to integrate on a constructive level.

"Antisocial Uses of Hypnosis"

In an article under this title, Dr. Paul C. Young (Psychology Department, Louisiana State University) reviews the findings of the experimental hypnotists. He makes it clear that psychologists, themselves,

have not been unaware of the pitfalls which H.P.B. elsewhere indicated would inevitably be encountered in the practice of suggestion—especially that the vulnerability of the subject is not "seeming" (as Erickson stated) but very *actual*. Subjects who are hypnotized, Young says, willingly enter into situations that "horrify" the observers and which any "person in his right mind would shrink from." In the editor's introduction to this article, LeCron states:

> If hypnosis can be dangerous to the hypnotized subject, then the public is entitled to know the facts. There can be no question of this. . . . A person in deep hypnotic state *can* be caused to commit antisocial acts. It is obvious that many people have criminal trends and many others are actual criminals. With such people, it should be no great task to cause them to commit an antisocial act under hypnosis. This will be granted by any hypnotic authority. It is the honest, conscientious, law-abiding subject who must be considered. He, too, can undoubtedly be deluded into committing such acts.

Whose the Responsibility?

LeCron discusses at some length the aspect of legal responsibility for acts committed under hypnosis, whereas Young is particularly concerned with moral responsibility. He says:

> The subjects were motivated to commit actions which they would not otherwise have done. . . . The criticism that they were subjects in an experiment and that they trusted the experimenters is not relevant. All hypnotic work (especially the work of Erickson and others) is experimental; and since they trusted the experimenter to the point of doing what they never would have done (all but one, who, it transpired, was a thief all along), they trusted not wisely but too much.

Dr. Young's "Conclusions"

He recapitulates:

> In keeping with the recent findings of experimenters that at least certain types of hypnotic hallucinations are real; that by means of illusions, delusions, age regression, transidentification, and other powerful devices available in hypnosis, the personality can be temporarily so altered as to circumvent the ego demands and implant complexes which are as bona fide as those of a neurosis or a psychosis; that the subject-hypnotist relationship itself satisfies certain infantile needs for love, subjection, and feelings of partaking in omnipotence, resulting in an obsessive type of compliance or helpless obedience,

> there is a strong presumption that a skillful hypnotist could induce antisocial behavior in hypnosis. . . . It is scientific naïveté to think that these powerful hypnotic techniques, used for all they are worth, can perform wonders up to, but not beyond the point where antisocial actions would be induced.
>
> If in skilled and worthy hands hypnosis is as powerful and salutary an instrument as its recent application, for example, in hypnoanalysis indubitably indicates, then in *skilled but unworthy* hands it might become an instrument of danger. From the present rather extensive review of both the theoretical and experimental findings—with particular consideration of the results of those who think hypnosis powerful only for good—it seems clear to the writer that this conclusion is the only possible one, and that hypnosis, therefore, must be thought of as a two-edged tool to be wielded with caution only by those who possess both an understanding of the motivations it releases and also the desire to use these dynamics for scientific and therapeutic purposes.

This is a start in the right direction, but still a far cry from the course Mr. Judge recommends in "Hypnotism and Theosophy" (THEOSOPHY 27: 58):

> Laws ought to be passed making it a misdemeanor to have a public or private hypnotic seance. And these laws should also be aimed at even those doctors who, under the plea of science, put subjects into absurd and undignified positions.

In view of the present "respectability" of hypnotism, theosophists may wish to review the many articles by H.P.B. and W.Q.J. on this subject. (See, for example: "Hypnotism and . . . Other Modes of Fascination", THEOSOPHY 31:4; "Hypnotism and Theosophy", THEOSOPHY 27:58; "Dangers of Hypnotism," THEOSOPHY 20:79; "Mesmerism", THEOSOPHY 12: 119.) For, as *Experimental Hypnosis* shows, these scientists—regardless of good intentions—are indeed working with a dangerous "two-edged tool."

THE "HARVARD RESEARCH CENTER IN CREATIVE ALTRUISM"

As was brought out in the article, "Word Puzzles," in THEOSOPHY for August, the word "altruism" and to some extent "altruists" themselves (especially if self-styled) are to a certain degree suspect in the popular mind. Nevertheless there are those, even among men of scientific temper and background, who are deeply concerned with the possibilities of altruism as a *force*—a creative force that will help clarify the field of interpersonal relationships.

The inspiration of one such man, Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin, was responsible for the establishment of the "Lilly Foundation"—the Harvard Center in Creative Altruism. In 1949, Mr. Eli Lilly, inspired by Prof. Sorokin's zeal, donated money for a five-years' term of research under Sorokin's direction, and the Harvard Center in Creative Altruism was established.

WHAT PRICE LOVE!

Various comments have filtered into newspaper columns from time to time in relation to the work of the Center, and now the June, 1953, issue of *Pageant* discusses its work. Although the writer of the article, Constance Foster, has definitely slanted her presentation to catch the eye of the popular reader (her title is "Harvard Invests $100,000 in Love"), there is a glimpse of the deeper meaning of the word "altruism" as held by the founders of the Center, and particularly by the man most responsible for its establishment. We draw freely from Miss Foster's article:

"LOVE IS THE ONLY CREATIVE FORCE"

> This slogan of a life's purpose was carved on a tree near Archangel, Russia, by Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin as he was escaping from the communists in 1919. It is the outcome of a deep conviction that came to Professor Sorokin on noticing how frequently it had happened that small kindnesses done by him *as kindness*—with no thought of future advantage—had resulted in great benefit to him in time of need. (For example, the commutation of his death sentence was due to his having done a good deed for the man who later became the Commissar of Justice.) Pondering on these happenings, Professor Sorokin decided that love was quite literally a "way of life," and that his life henceforth should be dedicated to proving it to others.

SOME OF THE METHODS OF THE CENTER

> The first thing the directors of the Center did was to make a survey of more than 1,000 persons scattered throughout the United States. Questionnaires were sent to people who were nominated as "Good Neighbors" by radio listeners throughout the country. These were people who "liked" to do small favors, whose consideration of the daily problems of others was a little more than average. The object of this survey was to find out, if possible, why people *"like"* to do good, what sort of background was conducive to thoughtfulness of others, etc.

> From this questionnaire, Professor Sorokin drew two conclusions: (1) that a certain amount of maturity was required before the sort of out-going friendliness of a "Good Neighbor" is attained [70 per cent of the number questioned were between 30 and 60]; (2) that the role of the home appears to be supreme. (Practically all those interviewed reported congenial parents, a happy childhood, and—in many instances—large families.)

There is of course no way of knowing how many of these "good neighbors" were in any of the categories suggested in "Word Puzzles" —many *may* have been using this activity as a means of escape from their own internal pressures, others may have been wanting to "draw attention" to themselves, but there must surely have been many also whose good will and kindliness *saw* the exact "need" of the moment and responded to it. This is "altruism *in actu,*" at whatever level of action it may be expressed. It is the *"personal"* touch of "charity" emphasized by H.P.B.

Another Point for "Research"

Another question the Center set itself to answer, at least tentatively, was "Can enemies be turned into friends?" The underlying idea of the directors seems to have been that a genuine and consistent attitude of good will would result in the opening of doors formerly closed; that it might result in at least a feeling of friendliness, if not friendship, between people who had previously considered themselves "enemies." Toward this end, Miss Foster's article states:

> They used six pairs of college students who frankly detested each other. One student in each pair was instructed to do small favors for the other, without his foreknowledge of the experiment—things like inviting him to a party, lending him a book, or simply offering him a cigarette.
>
> Within three months, five of the six pairs found themselves genuinely liking each other. The sixth pair weren't real enemies any more; just felt neutral toward each other.

The Duty of Reconciliation

In line with Mr. Judge's article, "Friends or Enemies in the Future," Theosophists will realize that the results obtained from the experiment are not blanket assurance that all enemies can be turned into friends in a few short weeks by small personal attentions. Rather, it would tend to show that the karmic enmity had been lessened (for this life) by

active friendliness on the part of at least one member of the pair in former incarnations, so that all that was now required was a further gesture of sincere good will to cancel the "debt." (Friendship or enmity, though, is not so simple a matter as Miss Foster seems to indicate.) As Mr. Judge said:

> No man becomes your friend in a present life by reason of present acts alone. He was your friend, or you his, before in a previous life. Your present acts but revive the old friendship, renew the ancient obligation.
>
> Was he your enemy before, he will be now even though you do him service now, for these tendencies last always more than three lives. They will be more and still more our aids if we increase the bond of friendship today by charity. Their tendency to enmity will be one-third lessened in every life if we persist in kindness, in love, in charity now. . . .
>
> Our future friends or enemies, then, are those who are with us and to be with us in the present. If they are those who now seem inimical, we make a grave mistake and only put off the day of reconciliation three more lives if we allow ourselves today to be deficient in charity for them.

"ELEMENTAL THINKING"

The Harvard Center is based on Prof. Sorokin's conviction that "Love, like other good things, can be deliberately produced by human beings. There is no reason why we can't learn to generate love as we do other natural forces." The Theosophist has, also, a philosophic basis for thinking that an eternal source of such inspiration exists at the root of man's own being, serving as a link between himself and every living thing in the universe. Albert Schweitzer discussed this aspect of "altruism"—that which intuitively leads toward "reverence for life"—in these words:

> Sincerity is the foundation of the spiritual life. Thought on the lines of Reverence for Life is by its very nature peculiarly qualified to take up the struggle against skepticism. It is elemental.
>
> Elemental thinking is that which starts from the fundamental questions about the relation of man to the universe, about the meaning of life, and about the nature of goodness. It stands in the most immediate connection with the thinking, widening and deepening it.